1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2	FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
3	U.S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE
4	EL PASO DIVISION
5	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA )No. EP:17-MJ-4409(1)-MAT
6	vs. ) EP:17-MJ-4456(1)-MAT
7	ELBA LUZ DOMINGUEZ-PORTILLO ) EP:17-MJ-4461(1)-MAT MAYNOR ALONSO CLAUDINO LOPEZ )
8	JOSE FRANCIS YANES-MANCIA ) EP:17-MJ-4462(1)-MAT NATIVIDAD ZAVALA-ZAVALA )
9 10	BLANCA NIEVE VASQUEZ-HERNANDEZ) EP:17-MJ-4499(1)-MAT
11	El Paso, Texas
12	November 1, 2017
13	STATUS CONFERENCE
14	Before the Honorable Miguel A. Torres
15	APPEARANCES:
16	FOR THE GOVERNMENT:
17	MS. LAURA FRANCO GREGORY MR. DOUGLAS RENNIE
18	Assistant United States Attorney
19	700 E. San Antonio
20	El Paso, Texas 79901
21	FOR DEFENDANT:
22	MR. SERGIO GARCIA
23	700 E. San Antonio, Suite D-401 El Paso, Texas 79901
24	Proceedings reported by stenotype. Transcript produced by
25	computer-aided transcription.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Let me call the following cases. Marshals you don't have to bring the Defendants up. EP:17-M-4409, the United States of America versus Elba Luz Dominguez-Portillo; EP:17-M-4456, the United States of America versus Maynor Alonso Claudino Lopez; EP:17-M-4461, the United States of America versus Jose Francis Yanes-Mancia; EP:17-M-4462, the United States of America versus Natividad Zavala-Zavala; and EP:17-M-4499, the United States of America versus Blanca Nieve Vasquez-Hernandez. We are here for a status conference I had set. Let me get announcements, please. MS. GREGORY: Good afternoon, Your Honor, Laura Franco Gregory and Douglas Rennie for the United States. THE COURT: Good afternoon. MR. GARCIA: Good afternoon, Judge, Sergio Garcia on behalf of all of the Defendants. THE COURT: Well, let me -- I know this is kind of a slightly unusual proceeding. Let me just let the parties know what is on my mind in these cases. We have had in the last number of months a number of voluminous 1325 prosecutions or a number of cases involving Central American defendants who are accompanied by minor children or minor siblings at the time that they were coming up. At least that was the representation that was made to me. Most of the time I have found out about this during the plea and sentencing hearings in these cases.

As you are all aware, we set them for one hearing, and it is either a plea or we will set it for trial at some point after that. At that time, it happened with some frequency in the last few months that the individuals indicate they were accompanied by a minor, they don't know where they are, they have not been made aware of the whereabouts or the well being, and some cases also I will say, and this is all part of the public record where they indicated they were not provided information at the time of their arrest and separation from the minor child.

So, I have been troubled by these reports that I am getting from these defendants, and I have asked the CJA counsel that I have appointed in these cases to just assist their clients in trying to get some information from their clients from --sorry, from the Government with regard to -- I have asked CJA to, frankly, take advantage of the fact they have a lawyer that can make phone calls and ask questions for them just to find out. I would imagine that, and I am always struck when this happens by how anxiety provoking I think it is for these parents who make the representation that this is their child or their sibling in some cases. So I have taken advantage of the fact they have an appointed lawyer to try to track some of this information down, and some of the reports I get back is the information is very tricky to track down.

So the Court has done its own research to look into this

situation and some of the legal issues involved, and it is something that is very -- it is a complex issue. There are -- it involves laws and agencies that really I had not been familiar with before this issue. I think last week really what I thought was when I did some of these cases I really -- I just need to have better information as to -- I need to have better information as to what the applicable laws are in these cases and really how they can be an issue in this Court in terms of the rearraignments, okay?

Candidly, and I am telling both parties my concern is with issues impacting the voluntariness of the plea because it involves a situation where at least for the Defendants where they were arrested by the Government that the Government at that time obviously they are not going to place the children in custody with them, and they take them to residential centers that are required by law to meet certain requirements of basic — at least basic — what is the word? I can't think of the right phrase, but that meet certain basic requirements in terms of their care and their well being. So, what I am concerned about is really just what appears to be the total lack of information that these Defendants appear to be getting.

Now, I am not suggesting that this is decisions made by individual agents or by an individual Border Patrol sector here or anything like that or by the Office of Refugee Resettlement, but the bottom line is they are not getting the information,

and I am a little bit troubled that by the time of their pleas they don't have this information, and I certainly had communicated in the past sometimes with defendants who say that their whole goal is to reunite with their kids or find something out about their kids. It is an anxiety that looms large. I don't think there is a lot of reason to doubt the sincerity of those expressions in most cases.

Here is what I would like to do. I am going to ask the parties -- I am going to issue a specific, and it is not going to be a long order, asking the parties to brief some issues that hopefully can answer some of these questions. I am going to reset this case for a status conference for next week.

Thursday is what I am thinking. I will talk to the parties about that in a second to see what their availability is, but basically, at that point, we can see where we are whether there is a plea at that time or a request for trial or whatever.

I just would like to get the parties positions, and this is why we have -- I have taken the individual step of appointing the Office of the Federal Public Defenders in this case. They are not subject to even some of the limitations that we have with a CJA panel and even in terms of what is authorized specifically in terms of how many hours they can bill, et cetera. I thought I am not going to get into that jam. I am going to ask the Public Defender to do this. I appreciate the Office of the Federal Public Defender assisting us in these

cases under these unusual circumstances.

Here is what I am getting to in terms of the issues. I will flush these out a little more and try to finesse them in the order I will put out hopefully by this afternoon or tomorrow morning at the latest. It is essentially this.

The first question is really what are the Government's procedures for providing information to petty misdemeanor defendants at the time of their arrest providing information regarding the well being and the whereabouts of their child?

Now, are there statutory -- I don't know what the process is. I never heard what the process is exactly. Are there statutory or regulatory procedures that spell out a certain protocol that should be followed with regard to the parents or is there something under the [inaudible] settlement which I am sure the parties may be familiar with with regard to these unaccompanied minor cases? The [inaudible] settlement spells out many of the requirements for the Office of Refugee Resettlement in handling unaccompanied child issues in lieu of regulations that have not been promulgated.

Basically, is there any authority for what information the parents are provided, and my look at this is looking at it really from the side of the parents or the defendants in my Court or who have been in my Court and/or who have active matters in the Court. That's the first issue.

The second issue is does a defendant charged with a petty

misdemeanor have any parental rights regarding their children -- sorry, does a defendant charged with a petty misdemeanor immigration offense where they are undocumented, do they have parental rights? There is just our research, and in my Court here the right to familial association I think the case is Troxler that talks about that under the 14th Amendment. So, does that -- it has been applied in a number of different contexts and is recognized as a fundamental right. Does that somehow apply to an undocumented alien 1325 defendant basically is what I am trying to get to. It is what I would like to find out.

If so, then the next question would be just assuming that right does exist, is any denial of that right, does it raise any issues akin to what was raised in Kentucky versus Padilla which is this kind of collateral consequence type issue that would have a bearing on the guilty plea.

That leads me to my final issue, which is the most important issue, but kind of by necessity it goes at the very end here is do I even have authority to hear any of this?

This is coming up to me. My concerns come up within the context of the Rule 11 guilty plea and the colloquy I have to go through. I think it is Rule 11(b)(2) that talks about the voluntariness of a plea where we follow certain questions and make sure the plea is purely voluntary and specifically somebody is pleading guilty because they are guilty and for no

other reason. So, my concerns have arisen within that.

It is not just -- basically, that's my feeling has been that these issues that I am raising kind of falls within my wheelhouse here because they do come up in Rule 11 pleas. At least that's kind of my view. I could be wrong about that. I don't know. I am asking you all to give me your position on that.

I know I am asking a lot. These are just questions that are coming up a lot. I'm really concerned about the issue, and so I hope that these are issues that you will be able to address. I'll spell them out a little more specifically. I wanted to give you an idea of why are we having this hearing and what is really concerning the Court. That's pretty much it. So, I would like the parties to address that if I could.

If we reset this for Thursday, I might ask you all to get me something by Wednesday, Wednesday of next week. Look, this doesn't have to be some [inaudible] monster brief. Address it. If you give me the top -- if there are cases that apply that two or three cases that are critical on a particular issue, that's it. I don't want you to feel like I just dropped this basically an appellate brief on you or something by next Wednesday. I would like to get them addressed, and if there are any other issues we need to take up, I would ask you to let me know.

Is there anything else the parties want to bring up at this

1 time? I will start with the Government. 2 MS. GREGORY: No, Your Honor. We will receive the 3 order --THE COURT: Yes. It is really these four issues. We 4 5 are -- I didn't want to come out here essentially empty handed 6 and say I have concerns, wait for my order and we will see you 7 next week. We will spell those out and have something out, 8 looking at the time, it will probably be first thing tomorrow 9 morning you will have something. 10 Mr. Garcia, anything you wanted to raise, sir? 11 MR. GARCIA: Yes, sir, actually I do. 12 Last week I was appointed to this case. My boss called me 13 to her office, and she said I want you to tackle that issue. 14 THE COURT: Okay. 15 MR. GARCIA: I went and I did research. 16 THE COURT: Okay. 17 MR. GARCIA: As you know, these cases basically have the same issue. They are all 1325s and all misdemeanor cases, 18 19 and I am ready to file a motion. In fact, I will wait for your 20 order, but I was ready to file it by this Friday. But because 21 all these Defendants are similarly situated and taking into 22 account notions of judicial economy, I was going to ask 23 permission from the Court to see if solely for purposes of this 24 motion or the brief that we file if I could solely for that, 25 for that pretrial motion, could I consolidate the Defendants so

1 I file one motion instead of five repetitive motions, one for 2 each one? THE COURT: Or one brief instead of --3 MR. GARCIA: One brief. 4 5 THE COURT: I doubt the Government would have an issue 6 with that. I will let you file a motion, and we'll see what 7 the Government responds to it. It sounds like a kind of more efficient way to approach. 8 9 MS. GREGORY: The Government has no objection to that. 10 However, the only concern is the Government is hearing about 11 these issues today. It appears Defense counsel had notice of 12 this before today's hearing. The Government would ask for the 13 seven days plus it appears you might perhaps raise other issues in your motion pertaining to these particular Defendants. 14 15 might cause the Government to need additional time to respond. 16 MR. GARCIA: Just for the record, the only thing I 17 knew is there were five misdemeanors and there were five 18 Defendants, and the reason I know this is because I have a 19 friend who clerks in the Ninth Circuit. He informed me they 20 were similar. Nobody gave me extra info. It is how I know, 21 and it is why I went with the research. 22 I am not opposing the seven day time limit that Judge might give us. I will wait until --23 24 I suppose the Government will have to MS. GREGORY: 25 wait for the Defendants brief if it will include facts

pertinent to each of these particular Defendants. THE COURT: I see what you are saying. MS. GREGORY: I don't know what you're going to file. As a result of it, we would need to respond to whatever motion you anticipate on filing. THE COURT: Sure. Let me think about this for one second. I do want to put this on the record, again, because this is a different proceeding than the way we ordinarily 

handle these 1325s.

I reached out to each party individually just to inform them of what the issue was related to these unaccompanied minors. As to each, there was no discussion of individual cases.

MS. GREGORY: The Government does not make that -THE COURT: Or anything like that. I wanted to be
clear about that. I didn't want to give, and I reached out to
the United States Attorney's Office, and I reached out to your
office just to say it is related to this issue, there may be
some briefing involved, and that pretty much concluded that.

Now, let's think about this issue for a second. These are basically -- you raised a really good point. I don't want to put you in a disadvantage where he will talk about the facts specific to each individual case and you have to respond to that because it is specific to particular cases. If that were the case, it would be a more traditional situation where you

file a motion and the Government responds to the motion. I need to think about this for a moment.

Basically, I really want to focus on the legal issues because I will say this, and just bear with me for a moment, Mr. Garcia.

MR. GARCIA: Sure.

THE COURT: What I did, and the reason I know these Defendants were accompanied by a minor was during the initials when I was on duty last week one of my last questions was are any of you accompanied by a minor child or -- I, at that point, took information and just asked I believe in all of the cases just I think I asked them and I said discuss it with your attorney. That's when I made the decision to appoint the Federal Defenders on the case.

In terms of -- I mean, the similarity in each of the facts is that they each represented to me at the initial that yes, I was accompanied by a minor. I think I asked in all of the cases don't tell me anything except the age and gender of the minor that accompanied you and whether it was a son or daughter or something like that. We have those basic facts which, quite frankly, is pretty much enough for you all to proceed with these issues. I don't know that it needs to be a kind of motion and response type situation.

MR. GARCIA: Judge, if I may? What I was suggesting, is no. The facts are pretty straightforward, and the facts are

not really what impacts the case. It is the law that you just mentioned that has the impact on the cases, the issues that you just talked about. Those are the issues that I was thinking.

A more efficient way for me to address those issues is wait for your order and address precisely those issues in a motion, consolidated motion, and basically a motion to dismiss, but it would be incorporating everything you just talked about because everything you just talked about is relevant to the disposition of this case.

THE COURT: I see what you are saying. So, now it gets us to what you are talking about. Well, I think what we could do then is in anticipation of a motion, this will protract the matter somewhat. Obviously, I am sure you are aware of that, and I imagine you discussed that with your clients.

MR. GARCIA: Yes. It is how I found out about the specific situation. When I was appointed, I quickly went to see them and it is how I --

THE COURT: Sure. Look, we want to do this right, and if we give you some time to file your motion, and give you some time to respond to it, nobody is really behind the eight ball and can address the issues with sufficient time.

What do you anticipate in terms of addressing these issues then? You indicated your intention is to file a motion that these are dismissed and want the Government to respond? When

1 would you anticipate filing that? 2 MR. GARCIA: Well, I am ready to file it Friday, but 3 if we could wait for your order, then I will make sure, and I 4 think I will incorporate every matter you talked about. I can 5 file it next week like you suggested, seven days, and give the 6 Government an opportunity to respond. I will tell you it is a 7 very complex issue. THE COURT: I know it is. 8 9 MR. GARCIA: And that it implicates constitutional 10 amendments. 11 THE COURT: Well, if we -- what do you think, 12 Ms. Gregory? MS. GREGORY: We are in an awkward possession. We are 13 waiting for the Court's order to brief certain issues, but 14 15 Defense counsel is going to file a motion to dismiss in response to the Court's inquiry on briefing issues. 16 17 What I would ask then if it appears that it is not merely a 18 brief to the Court, it is going to now turn into a motion to 19 dismiss which the Government would ask for under the local 20 rules the amount of time to respond. 21 THE COURT: Whatever standard time you're entitled to, 22 no problem. I mean -- I think that's what we will do. That's 23 what would be fair. My goal was just to get some answers on

law, but it is becoming an issue where I actually need -- where

it is going to be more than briefing. If it will be motion, we

24

25

will follow whatever standard deadlines. 1 2 I will ask you because you indicated you were close to 3 filing something anyway. I would say how about to not put it 4 out too long, maybe Tuesday of next week? 5 MR. GARCIA: You got it. 6 THE COURT: If we do Tuesday, and you will have your 7 time to respond after that, and then we will take up --MR. GARCIA: Just to make sure I cover everything 8 9 which I think I already did. If you can still produce your 10 order, Judge, giving us the points you want us to cover? 11 THE COURT: Sure. 12 MR. GARCIA: Then I will double check. I am pretty 13 sure I will cover that. THE COURT: I am sure you will make some reference in 14 15 your motion incorporating this request, and we will handle it 16 like that. 17 MR. GARCIA: Yes. 18 THE COURT: Is there anything else you wanted to bring up right now, anything? 19 20 MR. GARCIA: No, Judge, thank you. 21 THE COURT: I appreciate it. I know it is a lot I am asking both sides to do, but it is really an issue very 22 23 important. 24 MS. GREGORY: Fascinating. THE COURT: It is an interesting legal issue, and it 25

1 is complicated. It deals with statutes and other things. 2 I will tell you, again, keep in mind the last issue I 3 brought up, which is kind of the main issue, is this something 4 that I can even consider? The only way that whole issue in my 5 view can make its way into what we do in these misdemeanor 6 cases or under Rule 11 and under the findings of fact I need to 7 make for a Rule 11 colloquy so ultimately that is the 8 fundamental kind of issue. Is it something I should even be 9 considering? If I have no authority, I have no authority and 10 that's that. If I do, we will take it up at that point. 11 That's really a central issue. 12 MR. GARCIA: Thanks, Judge. 13 THE COURT: I appreciate everybody's patience. 14 really, really apologize about the mix up with regard to we do 15 some different things on the notice, and we had originally the original lawyers appointed, and then we appointed the 16 17 Federal Defenders. I thought it would take care of some of 18 these issues. I know it triggers with you all discovery issues 19 and everything else right away so I really do apologize. 20 That's on me. 21 Very well, thank you, we are in recess. 22 MR. GARCIA: Thank you, Judge. 23 24 25

1	CERTIFICATION
2	<del></del>
3	I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from
4	the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter. I
5	further certify that the transcript fees and format comply with
6	those prescribed by the Court and the Judicial Conference of
7	the United States.
8	
9	Date: January 17, 2018
10	/s/ Walter A. Chiriboga, Jr.
11	Walter A. Chiriboga, Jr.
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	